DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 214 487 HE 014 969

TITLE The College, the University and the Foreign Student.
INSTITUTION National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 25p.; Reprint of 1963 report with new foreword.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Advising; Admission Criteria; Cooperative Programs; Counseling Services; English (Second Language); *Foreign Students; *Higher Education; *International Educational Exchange; School Orientation; *Student Adjustment; Student Needs

ABSTRACT

Ways in which American colleges and universities can strengthen their foreign student programs are examined. It is suggested that foreign student programs now in operation in U.S. colleges should be viewed as part of the total international commitment of each institution and should be coordinated and interrelated with all other aspects of that commitment. There is a new dimension in educational exchange: the increasing use of education as a means of furthering the economic, political, and social development of emerging countries. These objectives cannot be achieved except by cooperation among universities, governments, foundations, international organizations, and other agencies. With respect to admissions, the basic task is to admit those students whose objectives can best be served by the resources of a particular university. In some cases, this may mean admitting an applicant from a developing country whose background may not be equal to that of a candidate from an educationally more advanced nation. Prior competence in English should not be a decisive criterion for admission, but sufficient training in English should be made available to those who need it. Foreign students need help in mastering the operations of the American campus and they should be exposed to American life in its broadest aspects. Academic advising should take place throughout the student's educational career, and academic advisers should work closely with the foreign student adviser. In addition, personal counseling of foreign students is an importrant component of the university's responsibility. It is proposed that adequate programs of services to foreign students require more institutional budgetary support than is now being assigned for this purpose. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED214487

The College, the University and the Foreign Student

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NAFSA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 014 969

2

National Association for Foreign Student Affairs

The College, The University and the Foreign Student

Winter 1979
Published by
National Association for Foreign Student Affairs
1860 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009

Contents

Foreward v

I. Education's Stake in International Exchange 1
The University 2
The National Interest 2
The International Community 3
The Added Dimension 3

II. The University's Responsibilities to the Foreign Student 7
Admissions 8
English Language 10
Orientation 11
Academic Advising 12
Personal Counseling 13
The Foreign Student as Alumnus 14

III. The Administration of Services for Foreign Students 17
Staff and Budget 18

Summary 20

Foreword—1979

Historical Review

In 1961 the Institute of Research on Overseas Programs of Michigan State University made an extensive examination of the services rendered to foreign students by institutions of higher learning in the U.S. The results of this inquiry were published in the report written by Homer D. Higbee entitled "The Status of Foreign Student Advising in United States Universities and Colleges." Immediately following, an ad hoc committee of individual distinguished educators was appointed by the then National Association of Foreign Student Advisers to review the areas of need revealed by the previous study and make recommendations for strengthening educational exchange programs in U.S. universities and colleges. Known as the "Committee on the Foreign Student in American Colleges and Universities," with Dean E. G. Williamson of the University of Minnesota serving as its Chairman, this group published its findings in 1963 in the report "The College, the University and the Foreign Student."

Present Position

At the time this report was first published there were only some 60,000 foreign students in the U.S., as compared with the present foreign student population of over 235,000.* However, the major impact of the rapidly increasing flow of students from across the world to U.S. institutions of higher learning was already apparent. The committee captured the significance of this post-war development and placed it in the perspective of the interests, concerns and responsibilities of the universities and colleges in this country. They clearly foresaw the inevitable growth of the new international dimension in higher education and prescribed the necessary programs and services which would be required to integrate the foreign student into the educational institutions. Despite the difference in statistics, their report speaks to the needs and opportunities which exist today.

"The College, the University and the Foreign Student" was timely in 1963 and is still relevant today. For this reason the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs has reprinted it. We remain grateful to the Dean Langmuir Foundation, which provided the funds for the original studies, and wish to express our appreciation to the International Communication Agency, which has made possible this third printing of the report.

Hugh M. Jenkins
Executive Vice-President
NAFSA

* The statistics in the body of this document are those of the original 1963 text.

I. Education's Stake in International Exchange

> "Universities must of necessity be committed to society, but the commitment must be on their own terms." —Eric Ashby

This report is concerned with the ways in which American colleges and universities can strengthen their foreign student programs.

The basic point, however, is that those programs cannot be strengthened in any meaningful or lasting way unless they are seen in the context of the total international activities, at home and abroad, of any given institution. Those international activities in turn must be placed in the context of the *raison d'etre* of the university.

The second point is that the responsibility for defining those activities rests squarely on the leaders of education—the regents and trustees, the presidents, deans, and faculties—whose primary duty it is to set the goals of their own institutions. If those leaders do not see educational exchange as falling within the basic educational program of their college or university, the foreign student program will be an ambiguous offshoot, a troublesome burden assumed by the institution in somewhat grudging deference to the wishes of society or the U.S. government. Isolated foreign student advisers, faculty members or community groups may be able to initiate some scattered improvements in the handling of foreign students, but the institution will fail both to grasp its opportunities and to meet its responsibilities in the absence of consistent definition and support from the top administration.

The third point is that the international commitments of the American college and university are permanent; they are not merely here to stay, but here to increase. This means that they can no longer be dealt with on an *ad hoc* basis.

We believe that *every* American institution of higher learning stands to benefit from engaging in some one type or several types of international educational exchange. There are many types of such exchanges. They may involve American students abroad, or American faculty abroad, or foreign students and faculty here, or technical assistance programs overseas, or training (of a technical assistance nature) performed in American institutions or research abroad—or a combination of all.

Exactly what forms of exchange will be of benefit to

the particular institution, only the leaders of that institution are in a position to determine. In general, however, we believe that the international commitments of American education are justifiable on three grounds: the self-interest of the universities, the national interest of the United States and the interest of the international community.

The University

The university's primary responsibility is to its ancient mission: the discovery and imparting of knowledge. Since the quest for knowledge knows no boundaries, the university is the one institution above all which is universal. It is the opposite of parochial; indeed it has been international since its birth. In fact, one of the oldest traditions of the university is its international character; for example, in the middle ages the student body of almost all universities was international. In this light, no student may properly be seen as "foreign" except for obvious practical and administrative purposes.

It is entirely fitting for the college or university to make full use of the foreign students on its campus as a resource for enhancing the educational experiences of its students, faculty and community. There is increasing realization of the American college's need to impart more knowledge of foreign cultures, governments and institutions to its American students. The presence of foreign students and scholars on many campuses offers rich opportunities in this respect.

The National Interest

We believe that American colleges and universities can serve the national interest, as broadly conceived, through intelligently planned programs of educational exchange. This does not mean that they should allow themselves to be used for furthering day-to-day policies or propagandistic purposes of governments and other external agencies, when they are not in keeping with the proper responsibilities, resources and aims of the institutions involved; far from it. It does mean that in vigorously pursuing their own primary goals—the advancement and transmission of knowledge—they contribute also to a primary goal of United States foreign policy: the creation and maintenance of free nations around the world. Old and new nations are presenting urgent requests for educational assistance at home and for opportunities for their youth to study abroad. In the

absence of opportunities for study here, many of those prospective students will—and do—go elsewhere. American universities can without question enroll many more qualified foreign students without neglecting their responsibilities to the youth of this nation. Here again the burden of responsibility rests upon university leadership; to resist pressures to assume inappropriate functions on the one hand, and to initiate activities which are fitting and promising on the other.

The International Community

No human institution has a greater stake in peace—and above all freedom—than does the university. At the very time that both peace and freedom are under constant threat, the university's opportunities to serve them are far greater than ever before. This is particularly true of American higher education, with its many years of experience in contributing directly to the economic, political, social and technological growth of this country.

The imperious needs—and demands—of newly independent countries, as well as of the older but less privileged nations of the world, pose a unique challenge to American education. Many leaders of these nations correctly identify education as the means by which their peoples can exorcise the colonial past and gain access to the political, social and economic advantages to which they aspire. That they hope to achieve these goals within a very few years, and with only minimal resources with which to work, simply adds urgency to the challenge.

Thus to the traditional goals of educational exchange—including the educational and cultural development of the individual for his own sake—is added another: the furthering of the economic, political and social development of many countries through the education of great numbers of their nationals who are expected to fill positions of leadership.

The Added Dimension

It is this new dimension of international exchange that confronts American education with vastly greater opportunities and vastly greater problems. It involves questions of both quantity and quality. It forces us to abandon the cliches and destroy the stereotypes that falsely constrict our vision of what educational exchange is all about. Most important, it makes clear the need for innovation and flexibility within our system.

There are now more than 60,000 foreign students on our campuses. In one decade the number had increased

by 75 per cent. If the present trend continues, the number will reach 100,000 by 1970.

It is not the number alone that presents the challenge, however; it is the variety comprised within that number. Who are these students, where do they come from, why do they come?

If the present trend continues, three quarters of all foreign students in 1970 will be from Asia. Africans from south of the Sahara have increased by 300 per cent in less than ten years. About 23 per cent of all foreign students here are studying engineering; other technical fields attract large numbers and may be expected to attract more. Increasingly, also, students are being sponsored by their own government, or by our government or by any of a large number of private agencies.

In short, the "typical" foreign student, if there ever was one, is no longer the cultivated youth from a wealthy Western European family who comes on his own financial resources for his own special purposes. If our government and other governments mean what they say about the importance of education for economic development, the "typical" foreign student increasingly will be from new nations and relatively underdeveloped areas, will come on resources other than or in addition to his own family's and will be seen as a means of fulfilling the objectives of whoever or whatever provides those resources: the U.S. college or university, his own government, the U.S. government, private agencies or a combination.

What this implies for American institutions is readily apparent. For one thing, it requires much greater variety, imagination and flexibility in the handling of students. The needs of a sophisticated graduate student in physics from India are different from those of a freshman from Cameroun who barely speaks English. The changes needed to accommodate such a variety range from devising appropriate curricula to providing adequate help in finding housing. We shall speak later of what we see as essential components of policies on admissions, the English language problem, academic advising and personal guidance, and so on. Here, however, we wish to emphasize the importance of enlarging our vision of the aims of educational exchange and taking the steps necessary to make that vision a reality. We do not renounce the traditional goal—the advancement of the individual—rather do we add to it. No longer can we view the student from Asia, Africa or Latin America simply as a promising student. We must see him not only in terms of his own needs, but in terms of the needs of his country.

When educational exchange is seen in this way—in terms of societal objectives—it becomes more closely tied to broad, substantive projects of a distinctive

character. Less emphasis is placed on the mere volume of international student traffic itself; more is placed on what the students do and why. The objectives are definite and long-range, not vague and short-term. Increasingly this approach is being followed by many sponsors of international exchange programs.

This brings us to another aspect of the question. The character of our international commitment is such that it cannot be met by governments alone, or by universities alone or foundations alone. More and more sponsoring and voluntary agencies are being involved. Exactly what the universities' relationships should be to these agencies, and how liaison may be effected or even simple information exchanged, is a source of some bewilderment and concern to both the universities and the agencies. The sponsors of foreign students include a wide range of organizations and institutions: our government and other governments, international organizations, private foundations, corporations, a student's home town or village and voluntary organizations of many types—professional, civic, philanthropic, youth-centered or church related. To add to this complexity, often an individual student or project is sponsored by several of these agencies, an arrangement which, while it has the advantage of spreading the participation and cost, has the disadvantage of weakening a sense of unitary responsibility.

The colleges and universities need to know much more than they now do about the wide variety of concerned groups away from the campus; those groups, in turn, need to know more about the capabilities and wishes of the colleges and universities. This is a problem in communications, and the federal government and many of the private agencies and universities are well aware of the need for such communication.

Basically, however, the need is for real partnership between the universities and the sponsoring and cooperating agencies. There is every reason for such genuine partnership: their goals, if not always identical, are seldom in conflict. Often their needs are complementary. For example, the universities frequently need the government's assistance in making certain contacts overseas and in dealing with foreign institutions or governments. Conversely, the government often needs universities' help in carrying out specific projects. And there are some things universities can do that government cannot, although it might wish to. In all these circumstances, it is appropriate for each to turn to the other in frankness and confidence.

Although responsibility should be shared, a large portion of it rests, again, on the colleges and universities themselves. Spokesmen for both the government and leading private agencies reiterate that they would welcome much more initiative on the parts of the institu-

tions of higher education. They assert that they are eager for the universities to assume leadership in those matters that affect education and to take more initiative in establishing policies and suggesting programs. It is the clear duty of the universities to do so, in their own self-interest as well as in the national and international interest.

American colleges and universities, however, are not in a position to assume such leadership until they take certain actions, some of them separate, some collective.

At the individual level, the leadership of each college and university must assess—and continue to reassess—that institution's resources and commitments. It must define and redefine its goals. It must evaluate and re-evaluate its current programs.

Such assessment, definition and evaluation will in many cases reveal the need for changes, whether they be in forms and methods of administration, in emphasis of program, or whatever. Courageous leaders will initiate such changes.

Far-sighted leaders will also be inventive and imaginative in finding means of appropriate cooperative action among universities. No one wants American higher education to speak with one voice; but perhaps it need not speak with several thousand voices, as it often seems to do today.

Already there are several cooperative efforts among colleges and universities—and colleges and communities—for handling foreign visitors. Many more such efforts are needed, whether they are for the evaluation of credentials, or the planning of orientation programs, or the provision of hospitality or of English language training.

Not every institution will want to, or could, or should, engage in every one of the many possible forms of international activity. But almost every institution will want to, and could, and should, expand and strengthen those in which it is already involved, and perhaps add others to them.

And whatever these decisions may be, every one of the American colleges and universities now enrolling foreign students has certain clear responsibilities toward them. In the following chapter we define the way in which we believe the colleges and universities should consider these duties.

II. University's Responsibilities to the Foreign Student

The foreign student is a *foreign* student. This fact should be borne in mind.

A few American universities take pride in saying, "We have no foreign students—just students." This makes about as much sense as saying, "We have no students of engineering or students of music—just students. We treat them all alike." Few good engineers or musicians would be produced under such circumstances.

Foreign students do have problems and concerns that are different—some in kind, some merely in degree—from those of American students. Some are legal and mundane: a foreign student needs a passport from his own government and a visa from ours to get here, for example; an American does not. Others are serious and profound: differences in culture, in language, in academic preparation, in social customs.

Yet despite these facts, many institutions do not assume even as much responsibility toward foreign students as they do toward American students in terms of providing them with adequate information, admitting them with due regard for their needs and looking after them once they are here. Currently, only about one-third of the foreign students are carefully screened in advance to ensure, insofar as is possible, that they have a reasonable chance of satisfactory academic and personal adjustment. The vast majority come on their own initiative, with but limited knowledge of what they will find here, where they will find it, what preparation they need and how much it will cost. In extreme cases they are without funds, without protection against illness, without sufficient command of the English language and without adequate academic preparation. In less extreme cases, they have some funds and at least minimum preparation, but they have been accepted by an institution which admitted them without regard to its own suitability to meet their needs or those of their country.

This haphazard system must be altered, not only for humanitarian reasons but for purposes of national and international interest and also for the interests of the university. Special provisions must be made by each college and university for handling foreign students, and personnel must be assigned the responsibility for making these provisions and carrying them out. The more effective the personnel and provisions, the better it is not only for the foreign student but for the insti-

tution itself. This does not mean that the special problems of foreign students should be dramatized; but they must not be ignored. It is a mistake to smother the student with unnecessary help and cloying attention; but it is heartless as well as dangerous to leave him to fend for himself.

The colleges and universities, then, have special responsibility with respect to their foreign students. This responsibility begins long before the applicant becomes a student.

Admissions

When we construct the ideal system, the foreign student program will begin overseas. There, every prospective student will receive accurate and comprehensive information about a number of American colleges and universities—what they offer in the way of curriculum, what kinds of institutions they are, even what the climate is like in their respective parts of the United States. He may receive this information from university representatives, or well-informed government officials, or from representatives of private agencies. Eventually, with the benefit of wise counseling, he will write letters of inquiry to several suitable institutions here instead of to a large number of schools, mostly Ivy League schools.

The officials of those institutions, in turn, will have at their fingertips ways of evaluating the student's academic preparation. They will know what a "6" in chemistry at a Sao Paulo collegio means; they will know what level a student will have reached when he has had two years of mathematics in the University of Tokyo. They will probably want to know the student's aptitude as well as his achievement; they will then ask him to take a test which overcomes cultural and linguistic factors. When they have satisfied themselves in these respects, they will then ask themselves whether what they can offer is adequate for him, whether they can make alterations which will make it adequate for him or whether they should refer him to a more appropriate institution. They will take into account other considerations too, with the help of on-the-spot interviews abroad with the prospective student. Will he do better at big state university X or will he perhaps achieve his objectives more fully in small private college Y in another part of the country?

This utopia, like all others, is difficult to achieve. But we can work to achieve it; and there are already methods available which we seldom exploit to the fullest.

In the first place, more American colleges and universities should, in specially prepared brochures, make meaningful information available to prospective stu-

dents before they come to the United States. They also can make clear to an applicant what his financial responsibilities are and what, if any, aid he may expect.

This will give the prospective applicant some helpful information about his prospective school. It is, of course, more difficult for the prospective school to acquire valid information about the applicant, including his academic preparation.

Ideally—and impossibly—each college and university would know all about every other institution in the world. Actually, however, each institution can collect a good deal of information, and in addition it should call on the knowledge of other agencies, such as the U.S. Office of Education, and consult with neighboring institutions which have had experience with students from one area or another.

Even when a university is in possession of a reasonable amount of information about an applicant however, a much broader question of policy remains.

The basic admissions task is to admit those students whose objectives can best be served by the resources of a particular university. We believe that many American colleges and universities have been too rigid in interpreting their admissions policies, and we urge that all of them reconsider them most seriously and carefully.

It is not reasonable to apply precisely the same criteria for the admission of foreign and American students for the simple reason that those criteria are not relevant to both groups. The objectives of American and foreign students will vary; and in fact the objectives of one foreign student will differ from those of another. Furthermore, the young man who has graduated from an Indian university may be better prepared or less well prepared for graduate work than the young man who has graduated from an American university; this depends on many factors, including the subject area of the student. But one thing is certain: the Indian student's background and preparation will have been different. Such differences must be taken into account. What must also be taken into account is the candidate's potentiality for making a worthwhile contribution to his own country on the basis of his American education. In some cases, this will mean admitting an applicant from a developing country whose background may not appear to be equal to that of a candidate from a nation with higher educational standards.

Those responsible for the admission of foreign students should seek clues as to the candidate's intellectual capability and emotion adaptability. They should assess what their institution is able to offer him in terms of his own and his country's needs. It is not enough simply to weigh test scores or equate mathematic grades in American terms.

Urging flexibility is not asking for a lowering of standards. Not every foreign student is qualified to enroll in every American university; the university for which he is not qualified, however, in many cases should refer his application to a suitable institution. The consequences of admitting the wrong foreign student are grave for the student himself and potentially for our own higher education. But the rewards for admitting the right student are correspondingly great, and we are convinced that more American institutions can achieve such rewards by pursuing a sensitive and imaginative admissions policy.

The pursuit of such a policy requires the efforts of at least three important officials of the university: the admissions officer, the foreign student adviser and a faculty member from the department in which the prospective student wishes to study. The admissions officer brings to the task his knowledge of the overall resources of the institution, its academic standards and the composition of its student body. The foreign student adviser brings his special knowledge of foreign cultures and also his experience in recognizing and assessing the many factors which affect the academic and personal adjustment of foreign students. The faculty member brings his particular knowledge of what can be offered in the candidate's special field of study.

Finally the decision is reached: to admit, not to admit or to refer to another institution. It is the university, and the university alone, which makes the decision; and the making of an affirmative decision automatically places other responsibilities upon the university.

English Language

Where English is the only language of instruction, proficiency in spoken and written English is perhaps the greatest single factor in the academic success of the foreign student in the United States. Or rather, it is the *sine qua non*: no English, no academic success.

Probably from 10 to 20 per cent of the foreign students now in the United States lack sufficient competence in English to benefit very much from study here. And actually the language problem is of even greater significance than the percentages imply. Often those students with inadequate English are from the newly independent countries which have the most urgent need to send young people here for training. The young people who will lead the social development of their countries are not only the wealthy students who have had the special advantage of intensive English study, but include in addition many who have had few opportunities.

This means that prior competence in English must

not be the sole determining criterion for admission, but the sufficient training in English must be offered to those who need it. In order to identify those who need additional English training, existing proficiency tests should be required, and better tests should be devised. Professional groups concerned with foreign students and language teaching are now in the process of developing such tests.

In interpreting the results of tests, however, one must take into account the question of how much English the student *needs* to know for his field of study. A graduate student concentrating on sociology probably needs more than one majoring in biology, and the one studying biology needs more than one studying sculpture, for example.

The essential need is for a variety of intensive language courses which a student may take before, or concurrent with, his academic study. Many institutions which enroll relatively few foreign students would not find it economically feasible to provide such programs; in any case, expert teachers of English as a foreign language are scarce. For these reasons, some groups of colleges have already joined together to provide language training in one place. This sort of activity should be expanded to the point where eventually every college can call on an English teaching center for help.

Orientation

Although public or private agencies here and abroad now provide some orientation for a limited number of students, the U.S. college or university should provide orientation for all students.

The foreign student needs two types of orientation. The first and most obvious has to do with all the essentials of becoming part of American life. The university must arrange the foreign student's admission and his course load, guide him through a maze of enrollment and registration procedures, acquaint him with the town, the campus, the library, etc., and answer dozens of questions that could never have been anticipated.

One of the most important services it should provide is helping the student find suitable housing. The college or university which enrolls more than a very few students must provide a variety of housing arrangements to satisfy the great range of personal tastes and needs of the group. Some studies indicate that most foreign students are happier when living in university residence halls rather than in a roominghouse. But this is not true of all foreign students; some might be better off in an apartment, a fraternity or sorority house or boarding with a single family in a community. The student's housing arrangements have a strong bearing on the quality of his adjustment to academic and social life

here, and the wise institution will make every effort to see that they are appropriate.

The second type of orientation that should be provided – and this should be a continuing process – has to do with introducing the student to American life in its broadest aspects. Many more efforts should be made to give the student an understanding of our ways, customs, and social and political institutions. These attempts should be made not for purposes of indoctrination, but because the student will not achieve the full benefit of his academic and other experiences here if American ways and living are not seen in the political and social context in which they take place. For this reason, the student should be introduced to many different aspects of American life, and he should be aided to realize the great plurality and diversity within the nation – that many Americans hold different values and attitudes.

Major American social problems – racial discrimination, for example – should be described accurately and candidly to foreign students.

There are many other subjects on which students from particular areas need information – on the relationship between men and women here, for example. And it would be helpful for a student from a country where the press is government-controlled to be told that the morning paper he reads here does not necessarily reflect the American government's viewpoint.

Ideally, orientation should begin before a student arrives in this country, continue in its different forms during his entire stay here, and be capped off with a predeparture session just before he leaves for home.

Academic Advising

The greatest responsibility that the American university owes the foreign student is to give him the best education possible. Many other factors bear on the college's ability to do so, but at the heart of the problem is academic advising.

Each institution should utilize qualified faculty advisers who are much more than program-signers. And the foreign student adviser himself, with whom the department advisers should cooperate, ought to have academic competence and recognition, and he should know his institution's total resources (human as well as academic).

The more the advisers know about the culture from which the student comes, the better. They should be conversant with the kind and quality of education the student has already received. Does the fact that the youth from Uganda has already had four years of high school mathematics mean that he is prepared to study

calculus? And what level of achievement is represented by the grade on his record? It is important that the student be placed at the proper level, and also that, if necessary, he be assigned to special, perhaps basic, courses in his field.

Academic advising should take place all during the student's career here, not just at its beginning. The adviser should watch for crucial points in the student's education—the points at which decisions have to be made. He will need to evaluate the student's work and help decide whether the student should continue his studies, and if so, in which areas and for what length of time. In this connection, it is especially desirable that the adviser be acquainted with the various professional opportunities—or lack of them—in the student's home country. The adviser should also be sensitive to the student's academic needs and flexible in programming his subjects of study. The load of work should be adjusted to meet individual needs. Sometimes it might be desirable to substitute one course in the curriculum for another.

Throughout the entire process there should be the closest cooperation between the academic adviser and the foreign student adviser. Each knows some things about the student which are helpful to the other; both should pool their knowledge and understanding of the individual case in the interest of the individual student.

Personal Counseling

The kind of personal and social adjustment the foreign student is able to make strongly affects his academic adjustment. This is true also of the American student; it is just that the problems of the foreign student are different and often more intense.

One of the most important duties of the foreign student adviser is to establish a frank and friendly personal relationship with each foreign student. The foreign students in any one institution are likely to be a heterogeneous group, with little in common except the fact that they are all away from home. Foreign students must be seen as individuals.

It requires extraordinary tact, skill and sensitivity on the part of the foreign student adviser to deal with the range of problems that are brought to him. There is the sheltered girl from Peru who is unable to fit into a new and complex social pattern. There is the Pakistani who is hurt and infuriated at being refused an apartment because of his "race." There is the orthodox Moslem who, suddenly questioning everything he has ever believed, finds himself deeply troubled. The adviser must deal with each of these problems—and he must also have the sense to realize when he cannot deal with

them and must instead send the student to a more specialized counselor (such as a psychiatrist or psychologist) just as is done in the case of American students.

Sometimes the foreign student adviser must take the initiative, on the basis of reports from an academic adviser, in suggesting that a student is wasting his time or misdirecting his energies. He may need to advise that the student change his program, or curtail it—or perhaps drop out of college entirely. In such a case, the skilled counselor can do much to eliminate some of the repercussions such an action might have not only on the student himself, but perhaps on his family and country.

Another responsibility of the foreign student adviser is to help the student develop rewarding social and personal relationships, particularly with Americans. Other university and community agencies serving all the students are, of course, a great help in this regard, but the foreign student adviser must serve as a catalyst in encouraging out-of-class and off-campus relationships.

The important thing is to make it possible for the student to become actively involved—in a student group, with a family in the community, or with other students. The foreign student teas and Sunday dinners that some American groups are so fond of are ineffective unless there is a follow-up. The non-academic community can, however, devise ways of drawing those foreign students who are interested more directly into some of its activities.

Financial problems beset foreign students—as they do all students. Frequently universities find it necessary to help their foreign students by arranging loans or opportunities for employment. Summer or other jobs, as a matter of fact, can provide added benefits to the foreign student. In addition to helping him financially, they can introduce him to many aspects of American life which he might never otherwise see.

A good personal counseling program is extensive and it must be paid for. But in the long run, it is both efficient and economical in what it saves in terms of failure, heartache, disappointment and bitterness.

The Foreign Student as Alumnus

The period immediately before the student returns home is very important in his life. He needs the opportunity to sort out his impressions, reconsider his experiences and sum up his stay. And he must prepare himself intellectually and emotionally for taking his place in his own country and community again. Some organizations, and a few universities, have developed pre-return programs which give the students opportunity to consider their American experience in terms of what it will

mean to them when they return home. Little money has so far been available for this type of program, although many people—including foreign students themselves—believe it is important and helpful.

International education, like all education, is a lifelong process. Yet few American universities have devised satisfactory ways of maintaining useful contacts with their foreign alumni—contacts which would be or could be mutually beneficial. Such ties can help the former student in his professional development and they can enable the university to make use of the former alumni's services, interests and talents. Alumni can help agencies which interview, test, or give orientation to foreign students and in some cases can assist visiting American faculty and students.

Strong ties between the university and its alumnus, however, can exist only where there were strong ties between the university and the alumnus when he was a student here. Again this emphasizes the realization of the importance of ensuring a sound academic and personal experience for the student while he is in this country. It is the college's duty to ensure this, and it can do so only when it assigns specific responsibility to important members of its administration and faculty.

III. The Administration of Services for Foreign Students

Whether a campus is a temporary home for 10 or 1,000 foreign students, certain general functions must be performed, certain special services must be provided. These functions and services must be coordinated and they must be paid for. There is considerable evidence that they are not well coordinated on many campuses, and there is substantial evidence that they are not sufficiently supported financially on most campuses.

Both coordination and financing pose problems which colleges and universities will wish to deal with in their own ways, in accordance with their own traditions, philosophy of administration, needs and resources. This is not a recommendation for any one way of administering the many necessary special services for foreign students because there can obviously be no agreement that any one way is suitable for some 2,000 institutions of higher learning. We do, however, believe that certain principles and practices are relevant to all those institutions.

The first principle, which has been stated already, is that the foreign student program should be seen as part of whatever other international activities the college or university is involved in and as part of the institution's total educational program.

If an institution is to plan a total effective program, all of these segments—and perhaps more—must be coordinated: the use of foreign faculty on campus, U.S. student abroad programs and the utilization of foreign students as resources in all sorts of activities, in class and outside.

The second principle is that the college, in accepting a foreign student, thereby assumes responsibility for providing certain services for him. It follows that someone must be responsible for seeing that those services are rendered. They might be rendered through a centralized organization, or they might be rendered through a decentralized system under which various services are provided by various departments of the university or college. In any case, the responsibility for coordination and implementation must be assigned.

Most campuses in the United States have designated an individual to serve as a foreign student adviser. In the preceding chapter are defined the areas of the foreign student program in which he should bear responsibility.

In general, the academic background attested to by

the Ph.D. degree or its equivalent is a desirable qualification for the person holding the post of foreign student adviser and his holding faculty status in an academic department is highly desirable. The foreign student adviser works with the faculty, and he must be one of them. And his role, no less than that of the faculty, is to educate the foreign students.

If the foreign student adviser has staff counselors to support him, they should have the M.A. degree or its equivalent. Relevant academic background for work with foreign students is found in a number of subjects: the behavioral sciences, counseling, comparative education, international relations, foreign area studies and American studies. Professionally supervised on-the-job experience may be substituted for formal academic training in counseling. And the value of experience in another culture is of course high.

The question of the administrative location of the foreign student adviser is often raised. On many small campuses which enroll only a few foreign students, his foreign student advising assignment is only one of several that he holds: he probably also teaches, and may have other responsibilities. In such cases he often is responsible directly to the president, a vice president or dean. In many larger universities he may head an administrative unit; in these cases he may be part of the student personnel division.

Some universities have created an agency responsible for coordinating all of the institution's international activities, including the foreign student program. The head of such an international office is responsible for maintaining liaison with agencies of the federal and state governments and private organizations; he is often instrumental in arranging overseas contracts; he encourages local support for the university's international activities; he oversees the campus foreign student program, the U.S. students abroad program and makes arrangements for foreign faculty as well as short-term visitors.

The most important thing of all is that each institution should define its international goals and assess and reassess its means of achieving them. *We would urge that every president now appoint a committee to evaluate what his institution is now doing, and how it might be improved.* Whatever decisions are reached, responsibility should be clearly fixed, and the individual or group holding it should have the active support and interest of the highest administrative officials of the institution.

Staff and Budget

It requires money to educate foreign students properly—more per capita than it does to educate American

students. There are the salaries of the foreign student adviser and whatever staff he might have. It is estimated, in addition, that an academic adviser must or should spend much more time advising a foreign student than an American one. And it may be necessary to provide special programs for foreign students.

As measured by the standards recommended in this report and in others, few, if any, colleges or universities are investing enough money or employing enough staff to provide effective services to all foreign students. On the basis of observation and the information available to us, it is our judgment that even those universities with very comprehensive programs are probably investing not more than a quarter of the money necessary to provide adequate services.

Increased support must be found. Although colleges and universities should be able to enlist additional financial support from community groups, American alumni, corporations, foundations and others, supplementary support will need to come from the government.

A precedent established by the federal government in the G.I. bill might be relevant. Students sent to a university by governments and other sponsors could be assessed a tuition fee based on the actual cost of the educational facilities provided. Some unsponsored foreign students would need to be subsidized through a reduction of tuition fees granted by the university, with possible matching funds from the sponsors. Perhaps it is superfluous to note that the *contribution* of the foreign student *to* the campus and the community must also be kept in mind.

We believe that the services described in the second chapter of this paper—and more—should be provided to all foreign students in the United States. We fully understand that the colleges and universities will not be able to finance them adequately without additional support. We urge them to seek that support vigorously.

We believe, however, that the question of additional financial support is less important than the question of moral support for the aims of educational exchange. The college will demonstrate the depth of its commitment by the energy with which it seeks and puts into practice new ideas for enhancing the educational experience of its foreign—and American—students. It will prove it by making changes within its own administrative structure when they are necessary to strengthen the coordination of the foreign student program. It will prove it by reviewing its entire policy in the international field—which in some cases will entail the making of a policy, since many institutions appear to lack one.

The leaders of our colleges and universities today are harried by gigantic problems and pressures. Their responsibilities are bewildering in variety, and there is honest question as to which commitments should rank

where in the hierarchy. Nevertheless, *leaders must lead,* and whether by action or by default, they do set the tone of their institutions. In the field of educational exchange, so overwhelming in its importance to the aims of higher education, they must lead by action and not by default.

Summary

The international commitments of American colleges and universities are permanent and increasing. The foreign student programs now in operation in the institutions of higher learning in this country should be viewed as part of the total international commitment of each institution and should be coordinated and inter-related with all other aspects of that commitment.

There is a new dimension in educational exchange: the increasing use of education as a means of furthering the economic, political and social development of emerging countries. The objectives of such exchange are definite and long-range. These objectives cannot be achieved except by cooperation among universities, governments, foundations, international organizations and other agencies. Where such efforts involve campus participation, colleges and universities must provide leadership. In assuming such leadership, each institution should determine how most effectively to improve its current program. The leaders of colleges and universities also need to explore new ways of cooperating with one another. At the campus level, each institution assumes definite responsibilities even before the enrollee becomes a student.

With respect to admissions, the basic task is to admit those students whose objectives can best be served by the resources of a particular university. In some cases, this may mean admitting an applicant from a developing country whose background may not be equal to that of a candidate from an educationally more advanced nation.

Prior competence in the English language should not be a decisive criterion for admission, but sufficient training in English should be made available to those who need it, possibly through regional centers for instruction in English.

The university and college should provide orientation of two general types: the immediate and practical, and the long-range. Foreign students need help in mastering the operations of the American campus, including the locating of suitable housing, eating facilities, book stores, etc. They should be exposed, throughout their stay in this country, to American life in its broadest aspects to give them an understanding of this country's

social and political institutions and the diversity within this nation.

Academic advising should take place throughout the student's educational career, and it should involve faculty who will give more than routine attention to students. Academic advisers should work closely with the foreign student adviser.

Personal counseling of foreign students is an important part of the university's responsibility. The foreign student adviser and his staff must be sympathetic, skillful and able to help the foreign students become actively involved in rewarding social and personal relationships, particularly with American students.

These foreign student services and functions should be interrelated with other international concerns of the institution. Only through the institution's president can policies be set and implemented which will provide adequate coordination of the university's international commitments.

Adequate programs of services to foreign students require more institutional budgetary support then is now being assigned for this purpose. To supplement their resources, universities and colleges should seek funds from their communities and from various foundations and private agencies. It is probable, however, that the financial problem will not be fully solved without increased assistance from government—local, state and federal. Desirable ways of enlisting and using such help should be explored.

• • •